

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the pending application is respectfully requested in view of the following observations.

In the claims

Claims 1-12, 14-17, 19, and 32-35 are currently amended to correct informalities identified in the Office Actions dated July 18, 2011 and September 23, 2011.

No new matter is introduced by the amendment to the claims. Entry of the amendment to the claims is kindly requested.

Rejection of claims 2-12, 14-17, 19, and 32-35 under 35 USC 112

Claims 2-12, 14-17, 19, and 32-35 have been amended to be directed to a “series of value documents” to be consistent with the series of value documents recited in claim 1.

Claim 1, 3, 4, 8, 12, 15, 19, 32, and 35 are further amended to resolve the indefinite language issues raised in the Advisory Action.

Claim 1 is amended to clarify that each of the value documents in the series comprises a value document substrate and at least two different feature substances for checking the value documents of the series. Claim 1 is further amended to describe the features of the first feature substance and the second feature substance with respect to the value document substrate.

Claim 3 is amended to recite that “the third feature substance is distributed substantially uniformly within the volume of the value document substrate of the

upgraded value documents.” Claim 4 is similarly amended to refer to the value document substrate of the upgraded value documents

Claim 8 is amended to recite that “a fourth feature substance is applied to the at least two value documents.” It is submitted that antecedent basis for the at least two value documents is provided in claim 1 which recites “a series of value documents having at least two documents.”

Claim 12 is amended to recite that “the fourth feature substance is printed on the at least two value documents.” It is submitted that antecedent basis for the at least two value documents is provided in claim 1 which recites “a series of value documents having at least two documents” and claim 8 as discussed above.

Claim 15 is amended to clarify that the coding represents information about the value document on which the coding is provided.

Claim 19 is amended to clarify that the “substrate” is the “value document substrate.”

Claim 32 is amended to recite that “the fourth feature substance is printed on the at least two value documents.” It is submitted that antecedent basis for the at least two value documents is provided in claim 1 which recites “a series of value documents having at least two documents.”

Claim 35 is amended to clarify that the “at least one coding extends over a substantially total surface of the at least two value documents.” It is submitted that antecedent basis for the at least two value documents is provided in claim 1 which recites “a series of value documents having at least two documents.”

In view of these amendments to the claims, it is submitted that the claims comply with 35 USC 112.

Withdrawal of the rejections is kindly requested.

Rejection of claims 1-6, 8-12, 14-15, 17, 19, and 32 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by US patent 6,155,605 (*Bratchley*)

Rejection of claim 7 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over US patent 6,155,605 (*Bratchley*) in view of EP 0 052 624 (*Kaule*)

Rejection of claim 16 under 35 USC 103(a) over US patent 6,155,605 (*Bratchley*)

Rejection of claims 33 and 34 under 35 USC 103(a) over US patent 6,155,605 (*Bratchley*) in view of *Anti-Stokes Phosphors/Luminophors (ASPL)*

Rejection of claim 35 under 35 USC 103(a) over US patent 6,155,605 (*Bratchley*) in view of US patent 5,169,155 (*Soules*)

The remarks made with respect to these references in the responses filed on September 15, 2011 are still considered to be relevant and are hereby incorporated by reference.

Withdrawal of the rejections is kindly requested.

10/10

Conclusion

As a result of the amendment to the claims, and further in view of the foregoing remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that every pending claim in the present application be allowed and the application be passed to issue.

If any issues remain that may be resolved by a telephone or facsimile communication with the Applicant's attorney, the examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the numbers shown below.

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC
625 Slaters Lane, Fourth Floor
Alexandria, Virginia 22314-1176
Phone: (703) 683-0500
Facsimile: (703) 683-1080

Date: October 14, 2011

Respectfully submitted,

/Justin J. Cassell/

JUSTIN J. CASSELL
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 46,205